APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/182,911	10/30/1998	BARRY G. WILKS	0100.9800830	2532

7590   02/13/2002

JOHN R. GARRETT
MARKISON & RECKAMP, P.C.
P.O. BOX 06229
WACKER DRIVE
CHICAGO,, IL   60606-0229

EXAMINER
LESPERANCE, JEAN E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2674	

DATE MAILED: 02/13/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 07-01)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/182,911	Wilks
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Jean Lesperance	2674

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE ___3___ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *Jan 18, 2002* _____ .

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL.**   2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1-31* _____ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) *1-31* _____ is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.

12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

    a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:

      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    *See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

15) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

16) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

17) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____

18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____

19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

20) ☐ Other: _____

U. S. Patent and Trademark Office
PTO-326 (Rev. 9-00)

                  Office Action Summary

                  Part of Paper No. 20

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-31 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S. C. § 103

2.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention Has made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over patent # 8,340 ("Butler et al.") in view of patent # 5,585,821 ("Ishikura et al.") in further view of patent # 6,108,014 ("Dye").

As for claims 1 and 19-31, Butler et al. teach a) receiving capability meters regarding a first display of the multiple displays (column 17, lines 2-33); b) substituting selected display capabilities for the capability parameters (column 10, lines 3853); c) providing the selected display capabilities to an operating system (column 5, lines 19-29). Accordingly Butler et al. And Ishikura et al. teach all the limitations as recited in claims 1 and 19-31 with the exception of providing capability parameters including resolution, pixel depth, and display refresh rate.

However, Dye teaches a display resolution for shaded (column 49, lines 66), both applications reside on the same display simultaneously and each uses only the memory required for its respective window size and pixel depth (column 6, lines 25-29), and screen refresh rate (column 6, line 44).

It would have been obvious to utilize the display resolution, the pixel depth, and the refresh rate as taught by Dye in the combined computer system disclosed by Butler and Ishikura et al. because this would allow much of the screen to be displayed with a smaller bit per pixel format.

As for claim 2, Butler et al. teach a method of claim 1 further comprises determining the selected display capabilities based on a composite of the display parameters of each of the multiple lays (column 3, lines 31-37).

As for claim 3, Butler et al. teach a method of claim 1 further comprises determining the selected display capabilities based on capabilities of a video graphics card (column 6, lines 28-39).

As for claim 4, Butler et al. teach a method of claim 1, wherein step (a) further comprises receiving the capability parameters in accordance with a system start-up (column 2, lines 24-37).

As for claim 5, Butler et al. teach a method of claim 4, wherein step (b) further comprises, der,: identifying the capability parameters as primary parameters (column 9, lines 22-34) in accordance with a first portion of the system start-up (column 3, lines 1-10); providing the capability parameters to the operating system (column 1, lines 7-17) in accordance with the first

ion of the system start-up (column 3, lines 1-10); and identifying the selected display capabilities (column 9, lines 14-33) as the primary parameters (column 13, lines 4-15) in accordance with a second portion of the system start-up (column 3, lines 1-10).

As for claim 6, Butler et al. teach a method of claim 1, wherein step (a) further comprises receiving the capability parameters in response to a monitor change process (column 10, lines 20-37).

As for claim 7, Butler et al. teach a multiple display Fig. 3 supporting module (column 5, s 19-28) comprises: a processing module (column 5, lines 55-63); and memory operably pled to the processing module (column 1, lines 7-17), wherein the memory includes rational instructions that cause the processing module (column 5, lines 55-63) to (a) receive ability parameters regarding a first display of the multiple displays (column 17, lines 2-33); (b) ,substitute selected display capabilities for the capability parameters (column 10, lines 38-53); and provide the selected display capabilities to an operating system (column 5, lines 19-29).

As for claim 8, Butler et al. teach a multiple display supporting module of claim 7, wherein memory further comprises operational instructions that cause the processing module to ;determine the selected display capabilities based on a composite of the display parameters of each multiple displays (column 3, lines 31-37).

As for claim 9, Butler et al. teach a multiple display supporting module of claim 7, wherein memory further comprises operational instructions that cause the processing module to

determine the selected display capabilities based on capabilities of a video graphics card (column 5, lines 3-18).

As for claim 10, Butler et al. teach a multiple display supporting module of claim 7, rein the memory further comprises operational instructions that cause the processing module ;receive the capability parameters in accordance with a system start-up (column 2, lines 24-37).

As for claim 11, Butler et al. teach a multiple display supporting module of claim 10, rein the memory further comprises operational instructions that cause the processing module ,

in order to identify the capability parameters as primary parameters (column 9, lines 22-34) in accordance with a first portion of the system start-up (column 3, lines 1-10); provide the ability parameters to the operating system (column 1, lines 7-17) in accordance with the first lion of the system start-up (column 3, lines 1-10) ; and identify the selected display capabilities (column 9, lines 14-33) as the primary parameters (column 13, 4-15) in accordance with a second lion of the system start-up (column 3, lines 1-10).

As for claim 12, Butler et al. teach a multiple display supporting module of claim 7, ;rein the memory further comprises operational instructions that cause the processing module receive the capability parameters in response to a monitor change process (column 10, lines 20-37).

As for claim 13, Butler et al. teach a digital storage medium for storing operational -actions that cause a processing module to support multiple displays associated with a drawing ace (column 3, lines 55-65), the digital storage medium comprises: first storage means for storing

operational instructions that cause the processing module to receive capability parameters regarding a first display of the multiple displays (column 3, lines 1-11); second storage means for storing operational instructions that cause the processing module to substitute selected display abilities for the capability parameters (column 14, lines 28-43); and third storage means for mg operational instructions that cause the processing module to provide the selected display abilities to an operating system (column 1, lines 7-17).

As for claim 14, Butler et al. teach a digital storage medium of claim 13 further comprises ins for storing operational instructions that cause the processing module to determine the selected display capabilities based on a composite of the display parameters of each of the multiple days (column 3, lines 31-37).

As for claim 15, Butler et al. teach a digital storage medium of claim 13 further comprises ins for storing operational instructions that cause the processing module to determine the selected display capabilities based on capabilities of a video graphics card (column 6, lines 28-39).

As for claim 16, Butler et al. teach a digital storage medium of claim 13 further comprises ,ns for storing operational instructions that cause the processing module to receive the capability parameters in accordance with a system start-up (column 2, lines 24-37).

As for claim 17, Butler et al. teach a digital storage medium of claim 16 further comprises ns for storing operational instructions that cause the processing module to, in order,: identify capability (column 9, 22-34) parameters as primary parameters (column 13, lines 4-15) in accordance with a first portion of the system start-up (column 3, lines 1-10); ride the capability

parameters to the operating system (column 1, lines 7-17) in accordance the first portion of the system start-up (column 3, lines 1-10); and identify the selected lay capabilities (column 9, lines 14-33) as the primary parameters (column 13, lines 4-15) in accordance with a second portion of the system start-up (column 3, 1-10).

As for claim 18, Butler et al. teach a digital storage medium of claim 13 further comprises means for storing operational instructions that cause the processing module to receive the capability parameters in response to a monitor change process (column 10, lines 20-37) .

Response to Amendment

Applicant's arguments filed on 1-18-2002 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The applicant argued that the prior art used, Butler et al., and Ishikura et al., do not teach "the capability parameters include resolution, pixel depth, and refresh rate". Examiner agrees that Butler et al., and Ishikura et al. do not teach the capability parameters include resolution, pixel depth, and refresh rate but another prior is found to read on those limitations. Therefore the rejection remains as was rejected in the previous office action.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

Application/Control Number: 09/182,911

Art Unit: au 2674

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this

final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should

be directed to Jean Lesperance whose telephone number is (703) 308-6413. The examiner can normally be

reached on from Monday to Friday between 8:OOAM and 4:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor,

Richard Hjerpe, can be reached on (703) 305-4709 .

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314 (for Technology Center 2600 only)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal drive,

Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Application/Control Number: 09/182,911

Art Unit: au 2674

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

Jean Lesperance

Date 1-28-2002

Art Unit 2674

RICHARD HJERPE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600